

### **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 3-12 and 14-22 will be pending in this application. Claims 2 and 13 are hereby cancelled. Applicants submit that no new matter is added in the present amendment.

The Drawings are objected to because they allegedly include unreadable text. Claims 12 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 4 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 7,120,606 (“Ranzini”). Claims 3, 4, 9, 11, 14, 15, 18, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ranzini in view of United States Patent No. 5,903,723 (“Beck”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

### ***Interview Summary***

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Ramy Osman participated in a telephonic interview on May 30, 2007, during which the above claim amendments were discussed. Agreement was reached, and Examiner Stace agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the above claim amendments.

### ***Drawings***

The Office Action indicates that there is an objection to the Drawings. However, in a telephone conversation on July 8, 2007, Examiner Osman instructed Mr. Eiferman that the objection to the Drawings should be disregarded.

### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

Claims 12 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that these claims are directed to intangible software. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 12 and 19 are hereby amended to recite a computing device and computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to performed the claimed

acts. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections are respectfully requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims 4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite. Claims 4 and 9 are hereby amended to remove various abbreviations. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 7,120,606 ("Ranzini"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 19 recite an attachment portion having protected content and comprising rights data relating to the protected content, the rights data setting forth each entity that has rights with respect to the protected content, and for each such entity a description of such rights.

Ranzini discloses information about security attributes that are available to be assigned to digital currency files. However, Ranzini clearly states that this information is stored in a criteria database rather than in an attachment portion of an e-mail (Ranzini, Col. 6, ll. 55).

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest "an attachment portion having the protected content and comprising rights data relating to the protected content, the rights data setting forth each entity that has rights with respect to the protected content, and for each such entity a description of such rights," as recited in independent claim 1 (or similar language from independent claims 8, 12 and 19). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 19 are not anticipated by Ranzini. Applicants further submit claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 16, 17 and 21 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Claims 2 and 13 are hereby cancelled. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 304791.1 / MSFT-2152  
**Application No.:** 10/607,898  
**Office Action Dated:** March 8, 2007

**PATENT**

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 3, 4, 9, 11, 14, 15, 18, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ranzini in view of United States Patent No. 5,903,723 (“Beck”). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 3, 4, 9, 11, 14, 15, 18, 20 and 22 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 304791.1 / MSFT-2152  
**Application No.:** 10/607,898  
**Office Action Dated:** March 8, 2007

**PATENT**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: July 9, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/  
Kenneth R. Eiferman  
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439